Claims 5-28 are pending. Claims 5, 10, 14, and 18 have been amended to put the claims into better form.

<u>Interview Summary</u>

Included with the Office Action of March 11, 2008 is an Interview Summary. It is noted that Applicants have already filed an Interview Summary on February 15, 2008 and incorporate that document herein by reference.

<u>Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)</u>

Claims 1-9,13-17, 21-24, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,622,237 to Keller ("Keller"). It is noted that claims 1-4 were canceled in the Amendment dates September 16, 2004. Claims 10-12 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,854 to Abramson ("Abramson") and Hennessy "Computer Organization and Design" ("Hennessy").

All claims stand rejected as either anticipated or obvious over Keller, U.S.P. 6,622,237. Claims 5 and 14 each have been amended to refer to a feature of embodiments of the present invention. If a load/store collision is detected, it is determined whether the data is available in a store unit (e.g., store unit 130 of Fig. 1; see Fig. 2 and paragraph [0024] of the published application). If the data is not available, the load instruction is deferred for later execution. Such a feature is not shown nor suggested in Keller. In Keller, the STLF predictor is trained with prior re-executions of load instructions. If the predictor provides an indication that a load instruction coming into the system has previously been identified in the STLF predictor, then that load instruction is scheduled after the corresponding store instruction identified in the STLF predictor (see Col. 12, lines 38-43). There is no disclosure nor suggestion in Keller to determine whether data for the store instruction is available. It is noted that this feature is not addressed at all in the current Office Action.

As to the remaining independent claims, claims 22 and 27, these claims deal specifically with the STA and STD uop pair of a store instruction. The current Office Action cites to large

sections of Columns 5 and 6 to show the features discussed in these claims. The cited sections, however, only refer generally to the decoding of macroinstructions. The cited sections do not teach or disclose the specific features related to these claims.

Abramson and Hennessy fail to make up for the deficiencies of Keller. These references have been cited for specific features in the dependent claims and do not teach or suggest the determining operation of claims 5 and 14 nor the STA/STD uop pair features of claims 22 and 27.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-28 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office is authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 11, 2008   /Shawn W. O'Dowd/
                              Shawn W. O'Dowd
                              Registration No. 34,687

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Ph.:   (202) 220-4200
Fax.: (202) 220-4201